#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Placerville	Division: Valley	Chapter:	5
Inspected by: J. Sherry	, valley	Date:01/29/10	5

age 1 of 3

number of the inspection in the Cha	pter Inspection	Check appropriate boxes as necessa on number. Under "Forward to:" enter ent shall be utilized to document innovaction plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum	the next level of command where the tive practices, suggestions for states	wide	
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection:	☐ Corrective Action Pla		
	Forwa	rd to:Valley Division			
Follow-up Required:					
☐ Yes ⊠ No	Due D	ate:			
Chapter Inspection:					
Inspector's Comments Re	egarding Ir	nnovative Practices:			
Area is compliant with police	cies and p	rocedures.			
Command Suggestions for one.	or Statewio	de Improvement:	- 1		
	or Statewic	de Improvement:			
ne.			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Inspector's Findings:  Area is compliant with police	cies and p		t Concur shall document basis fo	or response)	
Inspector's Findings:  Area is compliant with police	cies and p	rocedures.	t Concur shall document basis fo	or response)	
Inspector's Findings:  Area is compliant with police  Commander's Response:	cies and p	rocedures.	t Concur shall document basis fo	or response)	
Inspector's Findings:  Area is compliant with police  Commander's Response:	cies and p	rocedures.	t Concur shall document basis fo	or response)	
Inspector's Findings:  Area is compliant with police  Commander's Response:	cies and p	rocedures.	t Concur shall document basis fo	or response)	
Inspector's Findings:  Area is compliant with police  Commander's Response:	cies and p	rocedures.	t Concur shall document basis fo	or response)	

tc.)

# COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 2 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Placerville	Valley	6
Inspected by:	-	Date:01/29/10
J. Sherry		

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Placerville	Valley	6	
Inspected by:		Date:01/29/10	
J. Sherry			

Required Action	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	

None.

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 1/29/10
	NSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	1/29/10
Reviewer discussed this report with employee  Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SENATURE	2/8/10

## OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	DValleyivision:	Number 245:
Placerville		
Evaluated by:		Date:01/29/10
J. Sherry		
Assisted by:		Date:
n/a		n/a

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answer applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Except Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up a Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only or	l be comme ions Docun nd/or correc	ented on via nent and add ctive action(s	the "Remai dressed to s) taken. If	rks" section. Additionally, such the next level of command. this form is used as a Follow-up					
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Insp	ector's Signal	lure:						
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level	$\perp$		2//						
☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	Var	m/A	1/2						
Follow-up Required:	Command	ler's Signatur	<u>• / /                                 </u>	Date:					
Follow-up Inspection		19/1	Van.	1/25/10					
Yes No	Post	<u> (17,47)                                   </u>	10 4	4-L 1/29/10					
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6									
ote: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation	1.					
If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:					
Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of									
the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?		-							
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety	N V	r-, ,	P-7	-					
Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:					
engineering studies, system development or program implementations?									
<ol> <li>Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:					
identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	_								
Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for	⊠ Yes			Domorko					
non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	∠J res	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:					
Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management	☐ Yes	⊠No	□ N/A	Remarks:					
Unit (GMU)?	100	(-) 140	L. 18//-X	romans.					
Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:					
preparing concept paper budgets?									

### OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	∑ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
<ul> <li>17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?</li> <li>This would include any of the following: <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

### OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
20. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	nt Unit			
23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management  Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: UNK
Safety Program?				
	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:UNK
Safety Program?  24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:UNK Remarks:UNK

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Overtime

Command:	Division:Valley	Number:9245
Placerville		
Evaluated by:		Date:
J. Sherry		01/29/10
Assisted by:		Date:
n/a		~/4

applicat discrepa Furtherr	ole legal statues, or deficienc ancies and/or deficiencies sh more, the Exceptions Docum	litems with "Yes" or "No" answe ies noted in the inspections shal all be documented on an Excep ent shall include any follow-up a "box shall be marked and only	l be comme tions Docum nd/or correc	nted on via nent and add ctive action(s	the "Remai dressed to s) taken. If	rks" section. the next level this form is ι	Additionally, such of command.
TYPE OF	FINSPECTION		Lead Insp	ector's Signa	ture:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
☐ Divi	sion Level	⊠ Command Level		1.21	/		
ПЕхе	cutive Office Level	Voluntary Self-Inspection	(Cont)	1616			
	llow-up Required:	Follow-up Inspection	Command	er's Signatur	For		Date:
	Yes 🔀 No		Josep.	W Ally	<u></u>	14-6	1/29/10
HPM 4	plicable policies, refer to 0.71, Chapters 2, 8, an er 2, and HPM 10.3, Ch				/		
Note: If	a "No" or "N/A" box is che	ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	tilized for e	xplanation	1. ************************************	Maria Maria Maria
	Is the hiring company/age overtime being held responding minimum of four hours of uniformed employee, reg service/detail?	onsible for paying a overtime per CHP	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	to each CHP uniformed e notification is made 24 ho scheduled detail and the employee(s) cannot be no	assigned CHP uniformed of such cancellation?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	Are reimbursable special for all overtime associated projects?	project codes being used d with reimbursable special	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
4.	Is the commander ensurir overtime hours are not re Overtime Hours for Reiml	oursable Special Projects?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	than Bargaining Unit 7, wl	ned for an employee, other	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
6.	Is "RDO" being written in t CHP 415, Daly Field Reco a regular day off?	ord, for overtime worked on	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
,	Is there a CHP 90, Report Civil Action, completed for when overtime is associat	each officer or sergeant	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	

### OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

1	0 Datha OUD 445	T	<del></del>		
	<ol> <li>Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	9. Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	10. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None found this period.
	11. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None found this period.
	12. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	14. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	15. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	16. Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: